

REMARKS

Claims 5 through 9 are pending in the subject patent application. Claims 5 through 9 have been rejected.

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5 through 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Unger in view of Stokes. In rejecting claim 5, the Examiner contends that Stokes discloses, among other things, bearing surfaces angled at a first acute angle, and a mounting bracket lip angled at a second acute angle. The Applicant respectfully submits that this is incorrect, and that this deficiency in Stokes renders the claims patentable over this combination of references.

Stokes in fact discloses bearing surfaces and mounting bracket lips which are *angled at the same acute angle*. That is, it is clear from Figure 3 of Stokes that the bearing surfaces on the magnets are angled relative to the sleeve 32 *at the same angle* as the mounting bracket lips 42. Claim 5, on the other hand, recites two acute angles on these members; one angle is found on the bearing surfaces, and another angle is found on the bracket lip. The specification at page 4, line 16, to page 5, line 9, explains that since these two angles are different, the magnets are held tightly against the sleeve during thermal expansion. Since Stokes fails to disclose or even suggest different acute angles on these two members, claim 5 is patentable over this combination of references. Since claims 6 through 9 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 5, they too are patentable over this combination of references.

Further, in rejecting claim 8, the Examiner has found that the recited degree of difference between the first and second acute angles would be obvious, contending that the “general conditions of the claim” have been shown in the prior art. However, claim 8 depends upon claims 5 and 7. Therefore, the Examiner’s rationale in rejecting claim 8 would require that the limitations of claims 5 and 7 be disclosed in the prior art. As pointed out above, the limitations of claim 5 have not been shown to be disclosed in the prior art. Further, claim 7, which has not even been addressed by the Examiner, recites that the angle on the bearing surface is greater than the angle on the bracket lip. This limitation has not been disclosed in the known prior art, with the angle in Stokes *actually being the same on the bearing surface as on the lip*. Therefore, claim 7 is independently allowable over the known prior art. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully points out that, since Stokes fails to disclose or suggest two different acute angles on

these members as recited in claim 5, and since Stokes fails to disclose or suggest the first angle being greater than the second angle as recited in claim 7, the "general conditions" of claim 8 have not been shown in the prior art. Therefore, the limitations of claim 8 can not be found obvious under the Examiner's rationale, in view of the known prior art, and claim 8 is independently allowable over the know prior art.

The Examiner had previously indicated that claims 5 through 9 would be allowable if claim 5 were written in independent form, which it has been. This finding was withdrawn on the basis of the Stokes reference. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is still allowable over the new prior art to Stokes, since Stokes fails to disclose or even suggest two different angles on the bearing surface and the bracket lip.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 through 9 are patentable, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (800)555-9384 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 16th day of July, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald W. Spinks
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,843
Customer No. 22,875
P.O. Box 2330
Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone: (800)555-9384
Fax: (800)555-9386